



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,046	02/06/2002	Dennis Bigg	427.010-1-1	6027

20311 7590 05/01/2003

MUSERLIAN AND LUCAS AND MERCANTI, LLP
600 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10016

EXAMINER

KIFLE, BRUCK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
10/071,046

Applicant(s)
Bigg et al.

Examiner
Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.

Art Unit
1624



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 6, 2002
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 11 and 17-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1624

Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-10 and 12-16, drawn to a compound of formula (A₁), classified in class 546, subclass 48.
- II. Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14 and 15, drawn to a compound of formula (A₂), classified in class 546, subclass 70.
- III. Claims 17-20 and 22-27, drawn to a method of treating cancer using the compound of claim 17, classified in class 514, subclass 283.
- IV. Claim 21, drawn to a method of treating cancer, classified in class 514, subclass 283.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Groups I and II are drawn to structurally dissimilar compounds. They are made and used independently. They are independent and patentably distinct.

If, say compounds of Group I, were anticipated, applicants would not acquiesce in the rejection of Group II thereover or vice-versa. They are patentably distinct.

Groups III and IV raise different issues of patentability and are of different scopes between each other, and also of different scope from groups I and II.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and because the search

Art Unit: 1624

required for Group I is not required for Groups II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Charles Muserlian on April 30, 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-10 and 12-16, drawn to a compound of formula (A₁). Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 11 and 17-27 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because the continuity information in the specification and that in the claim do not correspond.

Applicants are also requested to identify all related applications.

Art Unit: 1624

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The last line of the claims should be rewritten as “or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt thereof” to be in proper Markush form. The term “and” requires the salt to be always present.

Applicant is advised that should claim 10 be found allowable, claim 16 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in-

- (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Art Unit: 1624

Claims 1-10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Burke et al. (US 6,291,676). The claims read on compounds of examples 75, 76 and 79-91.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burke et al. (US 6,291,676). The reference teaches a generic group of homocaptothecin derivatives which embraces applicants' claimed compounds (See cols 3-6, compounds of formula between lines 15 and 25 on column 3 and definitions for Z). The claims differ from the reference by reciting specific species and a more limited genus than the reference. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select any of the species of the genus taught by the reference, including those instantly claimed, because the skilled chemist would have the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and, thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within a genus. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ

Art Unit: 1624

423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 847 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-11 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,981,542 and claims 1-10 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,339,091. This is a double patenting rejection.

This rejection refers only to the elected subject matter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruck Kifle whose telephone number is (703) 305-4484.

Art Unit: 1624

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4556 or (703) 305-3592. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

April 30, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bruck Kifle", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Bruck Kifle
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624